DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 091 SP 011 296

AUTHOR Gress, James R.
TITLE A Study of the Impact of New Standards for Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 47p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); Curriculum Development; *Educational Improvement; Formative Evaluation; *Institutional Research; *Instructional Design; Preservice Education; State Boards of Education; *State Standards; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio

ABSTRACT

This study of the institutional impact of new standards for teacher education in the state of Ohio addresses two specific questions: (1) To what extent do the institutions perceive that they are already meeting selected provisions of the new standards? and (2) How do the public institutions differ from the nonpublic colleges in this regard? Of the 51 institutions contacted, usable responses were obtained from 33, including six public institutions and 27 private institutions. A three-part survey questionnaire was addressed to the chief administrator of the teacher education unit of each institution. Part one requested respondents to briefly outline sources and extent of familiarity with the new standards and to identify the most significant provisions with respect to the anticipated impact on their institution. In part two, respondents rated their institutions in relation to 45 declaratory descriptors of teacher education units and programming. Part three solicited demographic data. Analysis of the responses concerning the provisions of the new standards perceived to be most significant and of greatest impact on programming indicate that those elements of the new standards that represent the greatest departure from traditional practice (those regarding field experiences and specific curriculum elements) have more potential for effecting desired change than do some of the others. It was generally perceived that greater financial support for teacher education programming would be among the necessary conditions for improving teacher education. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

IS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
ICED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
E PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
ATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
ENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
DUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James Gress
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

A STUDY OF
THE IMPACT OF NEW STANDARDS
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

James R. Gress

The Ohio State University

October, 1975

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

In December, 1974, the State Board of Education in Ohio adopted new "Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers" (State Department of Education, 1974). These minimum standards for the approval of teacher education units in Ohio's colleges and universities were the product of dialogue among the state's several professional education constituents, as well as the public, which began in September, 1973. Both the process used to design the standards and their potential institutional impact on teacher education are noteworthy.

Search for Consensus

The unique dialogue which produced the standards actually began as a result of an earlier "Search for Consensus" among the state's local school constituents regarding the purposes and objectives which the public schools should serve and for which they might be held accountable. This earlier process was initiated and conducted by the State Department of Education (SDE) in response to a mandate (Am. Sub. HB 465, 1971) from the Ohio General Assembly to:

> ... Develop a comprehensive system for providing educational management and accountability capabilities. ... Developmental work by the Department shall ... strive, with regard to all public and non-public elementary and secondary schools in the state, to (1) define ... measurable objectives ... (and) (2) identify pertinent data elements and devise methods and systems for ... measuring and reporting the extent to which the defined objectives are met... The Department shall submit to the General Assembly on or before June 30, 1972, a report on its progress...

Consequently, the SDE directed a series of over 700 local school district and regional meetings during the 1972-73 school year to involve professional personnel, students and representatives of the various Ohio communities in identifying issues related to the need for the greater accountability of Ohio's public schools and the consequent priorities to which the schools as well as the SDE might address themselves. Feedback to the State Department based on the proceedings of local school district, county-wide and regional meetings culminated in a statewide meeting held at The Ohio State University, Columbus, in April, 1973. The state conference, "Alternatives for Educational Redesign," was focused on five questions to which the approximately 1500 participants addressed themselves in several small- and large-group meetings (Ohio Department of Education, 1973):

1. Would you favor a redesign of the governance of education?
2. Would you favor a redesign of teacher education?
3. Would you favor a redesign of student programming?
4. Would you favor a redesign of school-community relations?
5. Would you favor a redesign of the school curriculum?

Discussions were structured around sets of more specific questions related to the five general ones above and resulted in several recommendations to the SDE. Among those recommendations was the clear identification of a redesign of teacher education in Ohio as a top priority for revitalizing the state's public schools in ways that were perceived to be more con-

sistent with identified public demands than was then thought to be the case. Among the specific recommendations of the conference participants in this respect were the following (Ohio Department of Education, 1973, p.8):

1. Maintenance of essentially four-year pre-service programs in teacher education with increased attention to student selection and counseling;

2. Support for increased field experiences for pre-service students with attention to the extent and diversity of those experiences;

3. Inclusion in the pre-service program of course and clinical preparation in the areas of evaluation and group management as well as an "academic" major;

4. Development of an internship program for beginning teachers; and

5. Certification for college and university personnel responsible for supervising student clinical and field experiences.

Participants also reacted to proposed models for teacher education governance and accountability and to specific proposals related to the remaining questions posed for them.

Teacher Education Redesign

In June, 1972, the SDE initially reported its findings to the Ohio General Assembly and subsequently launched "Teacher Education Redesign." At an opening conference of college and university presidents and teacher educators in September, 1973, State Board of Education President John R. Meckstroth announced that the Board had adopted a resolution in the previous May (Institute for Educational Development, 1973, p. 5):

> ... To convene the distinguished leaders of teacher preparation institutions to begin a thorough, comprehensive, and appropriate restructuring of

> teacher education. Subsequent meetings with elementary and secondary school teachers, education-related organizations and the lay public will follow.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction Martin W. Essex then summarized the forces and activities which had led the state to this point and identified his own proposals for the redesign to follow (Institute for Educational Development, 1973, pp. 9-10):

1. Greater rigor in the teaching of a discipline of educational methodology;

2. Certification for clinical professors who work with pre-service students in the development of diagnostic skills;

3. Identification of "field professors" responsible for the conduct of a sequence of experiences for pre-service students at a variety of school sites;

4. Inclusion of an "academic major" in the programs of <u>all</u> teacher education students;

5. Supervision of student teachers to be done exclusively by senior teacher education faculty;

6. Preparation in the teaching of reading for <u>all</u> pre-service students;

7. One-year internships for beginning teachers under limited certification and the cooperative supervision of college and public school personnel;

8. Dual student teaching experience for pre-service students in inner-city as well as suburban or rural settings;

9. Earlier and more frequent field experiences for pre-service students to be used as a partial basis for selectively admitting students to programs; and

10. A fifty percent increase in state fiscal support for teacher education in its public institutions.

During the ensuing fifteen months, representatives of the state's professional education constituents and representatives of the public met to direct their attention to upgrading teacher education in Ohio through a comprehensive revision of the existing "Standards and Regulations Governing the Approval of Colleges and Universities Preparing Teachers in Ohio" (Ohio Department of Education, 1970, pp. 79-82). Groups included in this dialogue were of three kinds. First, eight statewide councils respectively representative of deans and department heads in teacher training institutions; teacher education faculty and their professional associations (ATE and AACTE); the Ohio Education Association (NEA); the Ohio Federation of Teachers (AFT); the Buckeye Association of School (Superintendents) Administrators (AASA); elementary and secondary school principals and supervisors and their professional associations (NASSP, NAESP and ASCD); the Ohio School Boards Association, the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers (PTA) and interested citizens; and the State Department of Education itself were convened. Secondly, a State Advisory Committee which was generally representative of all of the constituents identified and which also included a member of the Ohio General Assembly was appointed. Finally, a series of regional meetings, again representative, were conducted from time to time by the SDE and the State Advisory Committee. And the consultant services of the Institute for Educational Development under the direction of Henry M. Brickell were retained by the State Department during the initial stages of the "Redesign."

The eight statewide Councils served as sounding boards for the input and reactions of the particular interest groups involved. None

of these interest goups initiated the construction of a comprehensive model for pre-service teacher education though some were quite specific with respect to some ingredients - most notably the OEA and the teacher education deans in the public institutions. The OEA had previously proposed legislation to create an independent "Professional Practices Board" in the state with authority to oversee teacher education and to certify professional educators (Roberto, et al, 1973). The state education deans identified several needed components for improving teacher education programs (Deans, 1973). These included provisions to insure:

1. Greater teacher competence in teaching basic skills;
2. Greater teacher competence in managing classroom behavior;
3. Preparation in individualized instructional methods;
4. Greater teacher competence in dealing with current social issues and conflict; and
5. Experiences with career education, the non-school working world, and other cultures.

The deans also proposed the establishment of a professional advisory board which would make appropriate recommendations in the area of teacher education to the SDE as well as to the Ohio Board of Regents (a body responsible for coordinating the state-assisted higher education institutions), and they made several further recommendations to the SDE and to the Legislature as well. Finally, all the state-wide councils developed positions which reflected their reactions not only to the work and

proposals of the State Advisory Committee but also to similar proposals, including the findings of research carried out earlier under the auspices of the SDE (Blankenship, 1970) and the recommendations of the Department's consultants on Redesign (Brickell and Aslanian, 1973) as well as to the work of the Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio (1972).

The model of pre-service teacher education ultimately formulated in the new standards which were adopted by the State Board of Education as a result of "Redesign" was largely the result of the work of the State Advisory Committee and its sub-committee. This committee undertook a thorough examination of pre-service teacher education in the state. Its proceedings included consideration and "negotiation" of proposals from the statewide councils, from expert witnesses and from its own members. The committee also tested tentative drafts of its proposals in regional hearings conducted throughout the state.

New State Standards for Teacher Education

The new standards which resulted from this unique professional and political process and which are to be fully implemented by 1980 differ significantly in several respects from those which have been in force since 1970.

In addition, the State Board of Education has established a permanent State Advisory Commission on Teacher Education and Certification to oversee the implementation of the new standards and to monitor the needs of teacher education in the state. Finally, the General Assembly has recently appropriated monies to the SDE (Sub. SB 86, 1975) "... to provide professional services and to enter into contracts with approved teacher

education institutions and school districts ... to effect compliance with (the new) standards ..."

As an initial step toward full implementation of the standards, each of Ohio's teacher training institutions was directed by the State Department to submit by mid-1976 a plan for complying with the standards by the beginning of 1980. The potential impact of the specific provisions of the new standards on those institutions is as significant as the ultimate upgrading of teacher education which percipitated their promolgation and the extensive dialogue of which they are a product.

In this study, specific attention was given to the perceived impact of the standards on Ohio's colleges and universities which prepare persons for a variety of professional certifications. Attention was directed to the questions: 1) To what extent do the institutions perceive that they already meet selected provisions of the new standards? and 2) How do the public institutions differ from the non-public colleges in these regards?[1] It was assumed that answers to these questions would be valuable for assessing the potential institutional impact of the standards and for identifying future directions for the institutions involved as well as for the SDE.

DESIGN

The study was initiated in February, 1975, with the assistance, in part, of a grant from the College of Education Research Committee, The

---

[1]Comparisons were limited to public versus non-public based on an assumption that the other classifications identified below were subsumed thereby.

Ohio State University. It involved a collection of data relative to selected provisions of the new standards from all the colleges and universities in Ohio then approved by the State Board of Education for preparing teachers and other professionals in public education. The results of subsequent data analyses were utilized to answer the principal questions to which the study addressed itself.

The Standards

The eight categories of provisions included in the new standards mandate specific minimum provisions in the areas of institutional "Organization, Curriculum, Instruction, Faculty, Teacher Education Student Services, Facilities, Financial Support and Evaluation." Illustrative provisions of the new standards which highlight important differences with the present standards include the following selected provisions (Ohio Department of Education, 1974):

1. Establishment of cooperative relationships between teacher education institutions and the public schools for the preparation of teachers and the use of representative advisory committees;

2. Identification of explicit objectives, including requisite knowledges, skills, attitudes and values, for each certification program and the establishment of congruent selective admissions criteria and procedures;

3. Incorporation in all teacher education curriculums of specific elements including the teaching of reading, developing of human relations skills, analyzing teaching behaviors, dealing with behavior problems and utilizing multi-media;

4. Incorporation in all curriculums of both clinical and extensive field experiences;

5. Requiring teacher education faculty to possess appropriate minimum public school teaching experience;

6. Providing expanded student services to include orientation, individualized counseling and advisement, maintenance of student records and professional placement services;

7. Providing physical facilities and administrative personnel to respectively include identified laboratories, library and media spaces as well as a fulltime chief administrator, librarian and media specialist;

8. Establishment of student faculty/ratios of one/fourteen overall and for student teaching specifically;

9. Monitoring of institutional fiscal stability and support by the State Department of Education; and

10. Development of long-range institutional planning and evaluation to include follow-up studies of graduates.

A summary of the specific provisions of the new standards is found in Table 1 in the Appendix.

Population and Sample

In early 1975, fifty-one institutions of higher education in Ohio had the approval of the State Board of Education for the initial training of professional educators for a variety of certifications to practice in Ohio's chartered elementary and secondary schools. This institutional population included twelve state-assisted public institutions and thirty-nine private colleges. Descriptors of the kinds and range of size among these institutions include type of fiscal support, geographic location and size of student body. These descriptors were among those used in an earlier study of teacher education in Ohio (Blankenship, 1970, p. 5).

Of the fifty-one institutions contacted with respect to this study, responses were received from thirty-five. Of these, usable data from thirty-three (65%) was received which included six (50%) of the public institutions and twenty-seven (69%) of the private institutions. The institutions whose responses represented the sample of data which were the basis of further study represented the entire range of public and private institutions in the population under study with respect to the descriptors identified above. Table 2 in the Appendix summarizes comparative data with respect to the descriptors used.

Instrument

This study of the institutional impact of the new standards utilized a survey questionnaire addressed to the chief administrative head of the respective teacher education unit in each institution. The questionnaire contained three parts. Part I asked respondents to briefly outline sources and extent of familiarity with the new standards and to identify their most significant provisions, especially with respect to the anticipated impact on the institution and unit involved. Four specific questions were posed:

1. What is (are) the basis (es) for your familiarity with the new standards?
2. What, in your opinion, are the three most significant provisions of the new standards for teacher education in Ohio?
3. What standards (not to exceed three) will have the greatest impact on your own institution?
4. What specific plans is (has) your institution making (made) to meet the provisions of the new standards?

Part II contained forty-five specific declaratory descriptors of teacher education units and their programming. The items were based on

the particular provisions of the standards selected for study, and each respondent was asked to compare the institutional unit involved with respect to each item on a five-point Likert-type scale. A summary of the items which constituted Part II of the questionnaire are displayed as nine sets of selected provisions of the new standards in Table 3 in the Appendix.

Part III of the questionnaire solicited selected demographic data including identification of the certificates for which the institutional unit prepared candidates, size of the unit's student body and faculty and staff and approximate ratios of faculty and students in four areas.

Data Analyses[2]

Treatment of the data compiled from the sample respondents included several analyses. While the limitations of statistical treatments were recognized in the study and no absolute claims were made with respect to the models used or their results, it was felt that such treatments do provide appropriate means to produce a relative perspective for interpreting the individual data involved.

First, responses and frequencies for the questions posed in Part I of the questionnaire were identified and tabulated. Summaries of the responses and their frequencies for the four questions are found in Tables 4 through 7 respectively in the Appendix.

---

[2]The services of the College of Education Office of Research and the facilities of Baker Systems Engineering, The Ohio State University, were utilized in the data analyses.

Secondly, following calculation of an acceptable index of the reliability of the items (R_{KR8}=0.879) in Part II of the instrument, means and standard deviations for responses to each item as well as for the nine sets of items were calculated. The results are displayed in Tables 8 and 9 respectively in the Appendix.

Next, the forty-five variables constructed from the items in Part II of the questionnaire were submitted to factor analysis (Harris, 1975, pp. 205-224) in an attempt to identify a simpler underlying structure. Based on conventional tests, two alternative factor structures were identified which were useful for explaining some inter-variable relationships and statistical structure. However, neither of these solutions was thought to be congruent with a useful conceptual structure. These results may not be surprising since the attempt was essentially to find a rational/mathematical structure for a set of variables whose relationships also need to be understood politically. Therefore, for purposes of some subsequent analyses, the forty-five items of Part II of the questionnaire were grouped as nine sets of variables utilizing the organizational structure of the standards themselves for their construction. Items related to "Organization" were grouped into two sets (I and II) as they pertained to provisions for on-campus and off-campus relationships. Items related to "Curriculum" were also grouped into two sets (III and IV) as they pertained to provisions for course and clinical/field experience elements. The remainder of the items were grouped into five sets (V through IX) as they related to provisions for "Faculty, Student Services, Facilities, Financial Support and Evaluation." No items related to the brief provisions in the standards for "Instruction " were included.

Finally multivariate analysis of variance (Harris, 1975, pp. 93-131) and discriminant analysis (pp. 156-204) were utilized to identify differences between public and non-public institutions with respect to the nine sets of variables identified earlier. In addition, univariate analyses of variance were performed on each of the forty-five items as well as on the nine sets of items to further clarify identified differences. The results of these analyses are summarized in Tables 10, 11 and 12 in the Appendix.

Data gathered from Part III of the questionnaire were used, in part, to verify sample representativeness.

RESULTS

Findings related to the first question posed for the study are summarized in Tables 4 through 9 in the Appendix.

Table 4 displays the reported sources of information regarding the new standards which respondents identified. These included reading about as well as participating in one or more of the numerous meetings sponsored by the SDE as well as by the various professional organizations held in connection with the "Redesign." About half of the respondents indicated participation in one of the three types of "Redesign" meetings. In addition, some respondents had direct contact with SDE officials during the process and attended public State Board hearings.

Tables 5 and 6 display selected provisions of the new standards which respondents perceived to be significant, first, from the point-of-view of teacher education in Ohio and, secondly, in terms of anticipated individual institutional impact. Most often cited among the

former was the provision for field experiences for teacher education students. In addition, one-fourth or more of the respondents cited the provisions for establishing program relationships between institutions and the elementary and secondary schools, for minimum faculty/student ratios and for institutional financial support. In regard to the latter perceptions, the most often cited provisions again included those regarding faculty/student ratios and institutional financial support as well as those mandating specific curriculum elements.

Table 7 displays the reported efforts of institutions to comply with the new standards. At least half the respondents reported that they had undertaken general planning efforts of some variety while six have directed immediate attention to building student field experiences into their programs. Four others reported that their current efforts were probably already in compliance with the provisions of the standards.

Table 8 displays means and standard deviations of responses to the forty-five items in Part II of the questionnaire. The most positive perceptions reported ($\bar{X} > 4.50$) related to general institutional support for teacher education, provisions for student counseling and placement services, adequacy of physical facilities and institutional non-discrimination policies and provisions for due process. The least positive perceptions reported ($\bar{X} < 2.75$) related to the provisions for minimum student field experiences, support for cooperating school personnel and the related written agreements as well as for preparation in the teaching of reading for all teacher education students and for fulltime library personnel.

Table 9 displays the means and standard deviations for the nine sets of responses constructed from the forty-five items. Reported perceptions were relatively more positive with respect to the provisions regarding student services, physical facilities and those organizational provisions related to relevant on-campus activities. Those which were less positive included the provisions regarding clinical and field experiences, teacher education faculty and evaluation.

Findings related to differences in perceptions with respect to Part II of the questionnaire between respondents from public and non-public institutions are summarized in Tables 10, 11 and 12 in the Appendix.

Table 10 displays the results of the univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) for each of the forty-five items in Part II of the questionnaire. The serial analyses produced statistically significant differences between the two groups: (1) in providing fulltime institutional administrative leadership in the teacher education unit ($p < .01$), (2) in overall institutional support for teacher education, (3) in faculty/student ratios for student teaching, (4) in non-discrimination policies ($p < .05$), (5) in congruence between the level of institutional support and the presently-defined objectives of the teacher education unit, (6) in student preparation in the teaching of reading, (7) in faculty elementary/secondary school teaching experience, (8)in provisions for professional placement services, and (9) in fulltime library and media staff ($p < .10$).

Re-examination of Table 8 shows that perceptions of the respondents from public institutions were significantly more positive than those from non-public institutions with respect to fulltime administrative

support, in provisions for non-discrimination and in the preparation of students in the teaching of reading (items 1, 4, 6 and 9) while they are significantly less positive than the non-public respondents with respect to institutional support, faculty elementary/secondary school experience, student/faculty ratios for student teaching and in provisions for professional placement services (items 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8).

Table 11 displays the results of the univariate ANOVAs for the nine sets of variables constructed from the forty-five items above. The serial ANOVAs did not produce statistically significant differences ($p < .10$) between responses from public and non-public institutions. However, Table 12, which displays the results of the discriminant analysis and the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) shows statistically significant differences ($p < .10$) were found to exist between the two groups. Examination of the structure matrix produced by the discriminant analysis indicates that these multivariate differences are primarily attributable to relative differences of perception in public versus non-public institutions about the extent to which the selected provisions of the new standards related to financial support, faculty, facilities and student services were already applicable to the teacher education units involved. Re-examination of Table 9 reveals that respondents from the public institutions had relatively more positive perceptions with regard to the selected provisions related to faculty than did respondents from the non-public institutions while the opposite was true regarding the provisions for student services, facilities and financial support.

DISCUSSION

Conclusions from this study relate to its principal findings about institutional perceptions regarding their present status with respect to selected provisions of the new standards and to the principal differences in this regard between public and non-public institutions. Consequent recommendations are directed at the improvement of pre-service teacher education in Ohio.

Conclusions

With respect to the extent and effectiveness of communication with teacher education units in the several institutions of higher education regarding the progress of "Teacher Education Redesign" and the contents of the new standards produced, it may be concluded that the responsible institutional administrators were generally well-informed from a number of sources. Indeed, the state education deans had participated in one statewide council as a committee-of-the-whole, and the designated representatives from the non-public institutions also participated in a variety of committees under the auspices of the SDE as well as the professional associations.

Based on analyses of the responses concerning provisions of the new standards perceived to be most significant and of greatest potential impact on pre-service programming, it may be concluded that those elements of the new standards studied which represent the greatest departure from traditional practice, namely those regarding student field experiences and to a lesser extent those mandating specific curriculum elements have more potential for effecting desired change than do some of the other

provisions. In addition, it was generally perceived that greater state and proportional institutional financial support for teacher education programming would also be among the necessary conditions for improving teacher education, especially and presumably as it would enable institutions to comply with the provisions for non-course experiences and for maximum faculty/student ratios. In the absence of research evidence, however, these perceptions must be based on intuition and speculation. It can only be concluded, therefore, that what the new standards will bring about immediately may be something different from past experience. Whether that will be better ultimately remains to be seen. At present, most teacher training institutions in Ohio have begun some reanalysis of their pre-service programming and a few have moved immediately to implement new curriculum elements. However, fewer have had an opportunity to re-examine the interrelationships of an entirely new program focus. What effects establishing new relationships with practicing professionals in the elementary and secondary schools may have, and how quickly such effects may occur, are also unknown entities at this time. Again, while there may now be added opportunity for extra-institutional input for changing teacher education, it may not be concluded that this will necessarily produce desired results, especially as various constituent groups may utilize different criteria for assessing the effectiveness of institutional programming.

Results of data analyses related to the individual and sets of selected provisions of the new standards studied as well as results of

analysis of the comparative status of public and non-public institutions have already been summarized. Some additional insights may be gained here by relating these separate findings.

First, institutional representatives apparently have especially positive perceptions about the overall status of their student services, especially those related to student counseling and professional placement, as well as about current on-campus organizational and administrative personnel, patterns, policies and procedures. The non-public institutions appear to be most positive in this regard. However, all institutions may want to give some additional attention to their student orientation and selection procedures. The success of such latter efforts will depend, in part, on the ability to find useful research results on which to base initial admission criteria as well as the ability to relate these criteria to those traditionally used to assess progress in a program, namely evaluations in courses. The integration of course and field experiences may provide some continuity needed in this regard.

Secondly, some contradiction may at first seem to exist with respect to perceptions about financial support for teacher education. While analyses of the data from Part I of the questionnaire may suggest significant institutional concern about the level of financial support necessary to meet the provisions of the new standards, further consideration of related findings of the analyses of data from Part II, on the other hand, may suggest that institutional representatives have little fear about the availability of such resources. Several explanations of this possible contradiction seem plausible. Institutions may already be providing financial resources to teacher education units which are commensurate with the demands

of the new standards. This may appear to be the case especially for the non-public institutions. Alternatively, in the absence of such support, institutional representatives may either have not yet estimated or have under-estimated the magnitude of the financial resources needed to comply with the standards. Or, the institutions may have assumed that the needed resources will be available.[3]

Problems related to financial resources may be identified in two areas. First, institutional leaders must compete with a variety of other social needs for resources. The public institutions need to convince the General Assembly that teacher education is of greater priority than some other responsibilities of state government, and the non-public institutions must identify and tap new sources of revenue. Secondly, representatives of teacher education units must compete within institutions for a priority share of resources which are commensurate with identified needs. A common effort among institutions in both regards may prove to be more effective than the divided efforts of the past though such an effort may also require more effective checks-and-balances across institutions with respect to supply-and-demand and to appropriate divisions of institutional roles in teacher education than has been the case to date.

Thirdly, institutions appear to be least positive in their perceptions about the extent to which they currently meet the provisions related to providing teacher education students with identified clinical and field experiences, especially the latter to the extent that they may necessitate novel relationships, both formal and informal, with individuals and groups

---

[3] The State Advisory Committee on Teacher Education Redesign itself strongly recommended that the new standards not be implemented at all in the absence of needed resources.

outside the institution. Considering the related results of analyses of data from Part I of the questionnaire and the absence of demonstrated differences between types of institutions, this may be among the most important conclusions demonstrated by the study and suggests. in the absence of previous experience, a need by many institutions for outside resources and expertise for insuring optimum implementation success and intended effect. Of critical importance here, also, will be the identification of some third-party agency which can effectively accept responsibility for mediating the conflicts between institutions and the schools which will doubtlessly arise. Earlier cited recommendations from the state deans anticipate this need, and the legislative efforts of the OEA which were also cited reflect this ultimate concern. It must be assumed that the initiative displayed by the SDE to date in this regard also reflects this concern. Whether or not the SDE's utilization of representative advisory groups like the newly-created State Commission on Teacher Education will offset the potential conflicts of interest which may arise and how the SDE will manage the necessary coordination with the Ohio Board of Regents in this regard also remains to be seen.

Fourthly, the only specific curriculum element consistently identified as a matter of great concern among respondents was the provision regarding training in the teaching of reading as it relates to the various types of state certification for all teacher education students. With the exception of the provisions regarding field experiences, this provision was the only one with respect to which all respondents were generally least positive, though this was less true for public institutions than for the private.

Since this provision and the issues surrounding it are related not only to whether or not the desired training is provided but also to the nature of reading and effective reading instruction as well as to the criteria which may be used to assess the teaching of reading, attention should be directed to a resolution of the at least implicit differences among professionals as well as between professionals and the public in these areas. A continuation of public discussion in this specific area may be useful for identifying, for example, the degree to which perceived problems are a matter of lack of professional expertise, a matter of the validity of the criteria and instruments used to assesss such expertise or its impact, or a matter of value conflicts greater in scope than first glance may suggest.

Fifthly institutional respondents generally expressed concern with respect to the provisions concerning faculty. These appear to relate specifically to requirements for appropriate elementary and secondary school teaching experience and to the maximum faculty/student ratios identified. With respect to these provisions, public institutions would appear to have the greater problem. Since it seems plausible to hypothesize that much of this difference may relate to institutional differences with respect to graduate programming which emphasizes other faculty qualifications and interests and which relies to some extent on the use of graduate students, in turn, to support undergraduate programming, institutional units may want to consider a separation of the undergraduate pre-service, in-service and traditional graduate programming as one way to deal effectively with the issues presented. This approach may well result in smaller graduate programs per se. But that seeming disadvantage may, on the other hand, mean a lesser financial burden which could offset the accompanying lesser need for utilizing graduate students in primarily instructional roles. And it may free some existing

resources to support the kind of pre-service programming mandated by the new standards. This approach may also have the effect of unshackling thinking about the most effective approaches to in-service teacher education and push professional thinking about such approaches beyond the traditional graduate school model. Finally, this approach may also result in higher caliber though smaller graduate programs with, perhaps, fewer institutions involved than at present.

Finally, all institutions involved apparently need to invest greater resources in evaluation. No more specific results were produced from the study in this area, so it can only be concluded that attention to all three evaluation-related provisions considered, namely long-range institutional planning and overall evaluation design as well as follow-up studies of graduates, merit institutional attention to begin with. The latter provision may provide some of the data needed to establish a defensible research base for subsequent modifications of institutional programming as well as of the state standards on which it is based.

It is also worth noting that the distributions of responses to Part II of the questionnaire were definitely skewed. Quartiles for the distribution of means on a five-point scale for responses to the forty-five items for all institutions were 3.0, 3.6 and 4.0 respectively. At least three explanations are possible here. First, all the institutions may already fare generally well with respect to provisions of the new standards. In short, teacher education in Ohio may not have rated the top priority and the consequent investment of resources given it as a result of "Search for Consensus" in the first instance had those outside the institutions been as aware of the "state of the art" as those inside. Secondly, the skews may reflect the respondents' own inflated estimates and "pride of ownership." And these may, in fact, be justified to a greater or lesser extent. Thirdly, the

sample of respondents may have resulted from a "self-selection"mechanism which prompted representatives from the "better" institutions to reply to the study's survey and those from the others not to do so. This study does not conclusively demonstrate any of these explanations.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, some general recommendations, in addition to those already directed to the teacher training institutions, are appropriate.

First, those options for pre-service teacher education programming considered during "Redesign" but not incorporated in the new standards, and others as well, should not be completely discarded. The State Advisory Committee, for example, strongly recommended a continuing examination of the concept of a teacher education internship though they themsleves were not successful in identifying feasible alternatives for including it within the standards. And, in general, a truly experimental approach to teacher education is most desirable at this time both because of the absence of research results to demonstrate the greater effectiveness of a particular approach to the problems involved and because it has not yet been determined that what may result from "Redesign" will satisfy those whose pressures percipitated those efforts to some extent in the first place, namely the legislature and the general public. It would seem to be very desirable at this time, therefore, for the SDE to invest whatever additional resources which may be available in the identification of exemplary approaches to particular provisions of the standards and the systematic evaluation of such alternatives. Individual institutions should also pay particular attention to identifying and testing program alternatives. For example, carefully designed experimental studies might be conducted to assess the impact of the

"selective admisions" policies which are likely to be developed in many institutions.

Secondly, lest the teacher education curriculum suffer the same fate as that of the elementary and secondary schools (the "curriculum improvement by simple addition" syndrome), attention should be given to alternative organizing structures for the professional education component and to the integration of on-campus and off-campus course, clinical and field experiences. Some basis other than the separate subjects may be quite appropriate and most useful for organizing the total content of the professional sequence. For example, teaching tasks like planning, questioning, classroom management, and evaluation might be used to organize the entire professional content.

Thirdly, some cautions should be exercised with respect to the field experiences. Such experiences should be meaningfully related to other program components. Teacher education and elementary and secondary school faculties should identify needed models and roles for themselves as well as for their students in field experiences. The teacher education student's own program needs should dictate the roles which he or she can best play in classroom and other school settings, and every effort should be made to protect all students from the undesirable consequences of conflicts among the other groups which may become involved in this respect. Finally, actual field experiences should not be substituted, but rather used as a basis, for the necessary intellectual and theoretical development which remains a vital part of any teacher education programming. Some resources might profitably be invested by the SDE in monitoring the progress of individual institutions in these regards. The SDE might act as a clearinghouse for the collection and dissemination of relevant materials in this area.

Fourthly, the new standards will necessitate to a greater extent what has always been desirable in teacher training, namely the cooperative efforts of several constituent groups. And at least three important consequences flow from this fact. One is that wide involvement in all relevant policy- and decision-making is necessary. While this will mean slower results, the alternative probably precludes any effective results at all. A second consequence is the need for faculty re-training both in the institutions and in the elementary and secondary schools. In the final analysis, the changes presumably desired will result, in part, from changes in the persons involved. To simply change state standards or to change only organizational patterns or program requirements--even with the expenditure of massive financial resources--is not to effect change at all unless conscious efforts are made also to effect changes within the most important resources involved, those human resources which are a necessary if not sufficient condition for any change. A final consideration relates to the perhaps obvious problems of communication. Since the results of this study suggest that more is not known about the ultimate impact of "Redesign" than is known and since it was concluded that perceived problems in teacher education may be attributable, to some extent, to a simple lack of information, exploration of statewide communications vehicles should receive particular attention. The sharing of information about the progress of teacher education among institutions as well as between institutions and other constituent groups may, in itself, create some positive results. One result may be the evolution of new institutional structures (see, for example, Ryan, pp. 53-86) which represent even greater departures from our past experience but may ultimately be more useful for effecting the changes we seek.

What originated as a mandate from the public's representatives for greater accountability in the schools and was transformed in turn from a "search for consensus" on goals to a redesign of teacher education may prove for naught unless those involved deal experimentally, comprehensively and cooperatively with the problems involved and with the organizational and value issues which underlie them.

REFERENCES

Amended Substitute House Bill 465, 1971-73, State Appropriations Act. Columbus, Ohio: 109th General Assembly, Regular Session, 1971.

Blankenship, A.H. and L.J. Marquit. Teacher Education in Ohio. Cleveland, Ohio: Educational Research Council of America, 1970.

Brickell, Henry M. "A Report on Teacher Education Redesign." Columbus, Ohio: State Department of Education, 1974.

Brickell, H.M. and C.B. Aslanian. "An Approach to the Redesign of Teacher Education in the State of Ohio." New York: Institute for Educational Development, 1973.

Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio. Realities and Revolution in Teacher Education. Report No. Six. Cleveland, Ohio: Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation, 1972.

Harris, Richard J. A Primer of Multivariate Statistics. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Institute for Educational Development. "Teacher Education Redesign Conference Report." Columbus, Ohio: State Department of Education, 1973.

Laws and Regulations Governing Teacher Education in Ohio. Chapter EDb-301. Columbus, Ohio: State Department of Education, 1972.

Roberto, M.A., et.al. House Bill No. 279. Columbus, Ohio: The 110th General Assembly, Regular Session, 1973.

Ryan, Kevin (ed.). Teacher Education. 74th NSSE Yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

"Standards for Colleges and Universities Preparing Teachers." Columbus, Ohio: State Department of Education, December, 1974.

The State University Education Deans. "Ohio Teacher Education: A Position Paper." Paper presented at a meeting with the Ohio Department of Education, March, 1973.

Substitute Senate Bill 86, 1975-77 State Appropriations Act. Columbus, Ohio: 111th General Assembly, Regular Session, 1975.

What 125,00 Ohioans Want from Their Schools. Alternatives for Educational Redesign. Columbus, Ohio: State Department of Education, 1973.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF NINE NEW STANDARDS
FOR APPROACH OF TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

ORGANIZATION

- Authorization of Regents to award degree
- Total institutional support for teacher education
- Statements of objectives for each certification area
- Teacher education administrative unit
- Cooperative relationships with public schools for field experiences;
  - Written agreements;
  - Joint development of objectives and experiences
- Utilization of Advisory Committees
- Continuity of Student recruitment and counseling
- Explicit criteria for student selection/admission
- Student retention pursuant to course objectives and satisfactory clinical/field experience
- Absence of discrimination; due process provisions
- Written evidence of specific compliance available to all constituents

CURRICULUM

- Specification of objectives for each field of certification: knowledge, skills, attitudes and values
- Course based on specified objectives
- Curriculum include attention to:
  - Teaching of reading;
  - Development of human relations skills;
  - Analysis of teaching behaviors;
  - Dealing with behavior problems; and
  - Utilization of multi-media
- Student participation in clinical experiences-development of diagnostic/prescriptive skills
- Student participation in field experiences-continuous; various settings; cooperative supervision
- Clinical/field experiences equivalent in time to full academic quarter
- Full quarter of student teaching
- State department approval every five years and/or as revised

INSTRUCTION

- Variation of methods in all courses
- Utilization of multi-media

TABLE 1 (Continued)

FACULTY

- Fulltime, qualified administrator
- Specific faculty competence for each certification area
- Faculty possess three year's public school teaching experience
- Faculty responsible for "methods" courses possess three year's related public school teaching experience
- Faculty loads commensurate with objectives for teacher education and with institutional demands
- Limited use of part-time faculty
- Faculty/student ratio to approximate 1/14
- Faculty/student ratio for student teaching equal to 1/14
- Faculty rank, salary and load commensurate with preparation and experience
- "Grandfather clause"

STUDENT SERVICES

- Comprehensive services for teacher education students to include orientation, counseling, record-maintenance and placement
- Services consistent with institutional policies; published hours of operation
- Staff possess appropriate preparation
- Designation of times and places for provision of such services when other than full-time personnel

FACILITIES

- Specific provisions for physical facilities, instructional materials, equipment and other resources
- Adequate and safe physical plant
- Adequate library resources
- Fulltime librarian
- Adequate laboratories and equipment
- Space and equipment for clinical experiences
- Adequate educational media center
- Fulltime media specialist

TABLE 1 (Continued)

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Financial stability and institutional resources commensurate with standards and program objectives
Annual institutional fiscal analysis submitted to state department

EVALUATION

Well-defined plan to include follow-up study of graduates
Basis for long-range planning
State department evaluation at least every five years
Preparation of appropriate reports

Source: "Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers," Laws and Regulations Governing Teacher Education and Certification, Chapter EDb-303. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Education, December, 1974.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF SAMPLE RESPONDENTS COMPARED WITH STATE POPULATION

	Population	Sample
Type of Support		
Public	12	6
Non-Public	39	27
Location		
Urban[a]	22	13
Non-Urban	29	20
Size of Student Body		
Large[b]	14	8
Small	37	25

[a]Urban institutions were located in the metropolitan areas of Akron-Canton, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Dayton, Toledo and Youngstown.

[b]Large institutions had total student enrollments in 1974-75 greater than 5700, the mean for all Ohio institutions in 1970-71.

TABLE 3

NINE SETS OF SELECTED PROVISIONS
OF THE NEW STANDARDS

Set		Title/Items
I		ORGANIZATION I
	1	Total institutional support for teacher education
	2	Statements of objectives for each certification area
	6	Continuity of student recruitment
	7	Explicit criteria for student selection/admission
	44	Absence of discrimination
	45	Due process provisions
II		ORGANIZATION II
	20	Written agreements with cooperating schools
	21	In-service for cooperating school personnel
	42,43	Utilization of representative advisory committees
III		CURRICULUM I
	8	Specification of objectives for each field of certification: knowledge, skills, attitudes and values
		Specific focus on:
	9	Teaching of reading;
	10	Development of human relations skills;
	11	Dealing with classroom behavior problems
	12	Self-analysis of teaching performance/behaviors;
	13	Use of multi-media
IV		CURRICULUM II
	14	Inclusion of clinical experiences
	15	Opportunities to diagnose and prescribe for learning difficulties
	16	Inclusion of field experiences
	17	Written objectives for field experiences
	18	Field experiences in various settings
	19	Time for clinical and field experiences equivalent to one academic quarter
	22	Appropriate experience requirements for cooperating personnel

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Set		Title/Item
V		FACULTY
	23	Three years' teaching experience in elementary/ secondary schools
	24	Background and teaching experience for "methods" faculty
	25	Promotion/tenure and salary criteria recognize value of field/in-service activities
	34	Fulltime administrator
	35	1/14 faculty/student ratio overall
	36	1/14 faculty/student ratio for student teaching
	37	Fulltime librarian
	38	Fulltime media specialist
VI		STUDENT SERVICES
	26	Orientation program
	27	Convenient counseling and advisement services
	28	Professional placement office
VII		FACILITIES
	29	Adequate and safe physical facilities
	30	Adequate library
	31	Adequate media center
	33	Student laboratory spaces
	32	Adequate instructional and laboratory materials and equipment
VIII		FINANCIAL SUPPORT
	3	Fiscal stability of institution
	4	Fiscal resources commensurate with defined program objectives
	5	Fiscal resources commensurate with new standards
IX		EVALUATION
	39	Well-defined program of evaluation
	40	Follow-up studies of graduates
	41	Written long-range program plans

TABLE 4
SUMMARY OF SOURCES AND THEIR FREQUENCIES
REGARDING INFORMATION ABOUT THE NEW STANDARDS

Source	Frequency
Reading of reports	09
Participation in:	
Redesign public meetings	16
Redesign committee meetings	05
Private colleges'meetings	09
State Deans'meetings	02
OATE and/or OASCD meetings	09
Attendance at State Board Hearings	05
Contact with State Department Officials	07
Total	33

TABLE 5

SUMMARY FREQUENCIES OF PERCEIVED SIGNIFICANCE OF SELECTED PROVISIONS OF THE NEW STANDARDS

Provision	Frequency
ORGANIZATION	
Specification of objectives	03
Relationships with schools (especially written agreements)	09
Use of advisory committees	01
Explicit student admission criteria	02
CURRICULUM	
Specification of curriculum areas	06
Specific reading requirement	04
Specific human relations requirement	01
Clinical experiences	05
Field experiences	29
Early field experiences	02
INSTRUCTION	
(None)	
FACULTY	
Public school experience	02
Constraints on faculty load	01
Faculty/student ratios	13
STUDENT SERVICES	
Explicit provisions for types	03
FACILITIES	
Media center	01
FINANCIAL SUPPORT	
Level	08
State department controls	01
Implementation contingent upon available resources*	04
EVALUATION	
(None)	
NO RESPONSE	01

*Not a provision of the Standards per se; separate recommendatin of State Redesign Committee.

TABLE 6

SUMMARY FREQUENCIES OF SELECTED PROVISIONS OF NEW STANDARDS PERCEIVED TO HAVE GREATEST INSTITUTIONAL IMPACT

Provision	Frequency
ORGANIZATION	
Specification of objectives	02
Relationships with schools	04
Use of advisory committee (s)	01
Explicit student admission criteria	01
CURRICULUM	
Specification of curriculum areas	08
Specific reading requirement	02
Specific human relations requirement	01
Clinical experiences	06
Field experiences	21
INSTRUCTION	
(None)	
FACULTY	
Public school experience	01
Faculty/student ratios	17
STUDENT SERVICES	
Explicit provisions for types	02
FACILITIES	
(None)	
FINANCIAL SUPPORT	
Level	08
EVALUATION	
(None)	
NONE OF THE ABOVE	01
NO RESPONSE	02

TABLE 7

SUMMARY FREQUENCIES OF INSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS CONSEQUENT TO SELECTED PROVISIONS OF THE NEW STANDARDS

Provision/Action	Frequency
ORGANIZATION	
Developing relationships/written agreements with schools	03
Using advisory committee (s)	02
Developing recruitment mechanisms	01
CURRICULUM	
Adding reading courses	01
Adding or strengthening field experience components	06
INSTRUCTION	
(None)	
FACULTY	
Adding faculty/staff	02
Retraining faculty	02
Returning faculty to elementary/secondary schools	01
STUDENT SERVICES	
Developing procedures for screening/counseling	01
FACILITIES	
(None)	
FINANCIAL SUPPORT	
Reviewing budget implications	01
EVALUATION	
Developing long-range planning/evaluation mechanisms	02
Conducting student follow-up studies	01

TABLE 7 (Continued)

Provision/Action	Frequency
OTHER	
Continuing past and present efforts	04
Conducting general planning and review	16
Conducting comprehensive curriculum evaluation	05
Setting time-lines for implementation/compliance	02
Exploring "teacher center" concept	02
Exploring/programming PBTE	02
NO RESPONSE	02

TABLE 8
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
FOR TWO GROUPS ON FORTY-FIVE VARIABLES

Variable		Group I	Group II	Total
1	$\bar{X}$	4.33	4.89	4.79
	SD			0.55
2	$\bar{X}$	3.50	2.93	3.03
	SD			1.19
3	$\bar{X}$	4.17	4.11	4.12
	SD			1.02
4	$\bar{X}$	3.33	4.04	3.91
	SD			0.88
5	$\bar{X}$	2.50	3.37	3.21
	SD			1.32
6	$\bar{X}$	3.00	3.30	3.24
	SD			1.20
7	$\bar{X}$	3.17	3.81	3.70
	SD			1.05
8	$\bar{X}$	3.00	2.93	2.94
	SD			0.99
9	$\bar{X}$	3.50	2.44	2.64
	SD			1.27
10	$\bar{X}$	3.50	3.19	3.24
	SD			1.15
11	$\bar{X}$	3.50	3.78	3.73
	SD			1.10
12	$\bar{X}$	3.33	3.81	3.73
	SD			1.01
13	$\bar{X}$	3.50	4.07	3.97
	SD			1.05
14	$\bar{X}$	2.50	2.85	2.79
	SD			0.96

TABLE 8 (Continued)

Variable		Group I	Group II	Total
15	$\bar{X}$	2.67	2.93	2.88
	SD			1.22
16	$\bar{X}$	4.67	4.52	4.55
	SD			0.75
17	$\bar{X}$	3.33	3.26	3.27
	SD			1.13
18	$\bar{X}$	4.33	4.00	4.06
	SD			1.03
19	$\bar{X}$	2.83	2.26	2.37
	SD			1.54
20	$\bar{X}$	3.00	2.15	2.30
	SD			1.40
21	$\bar{X}$	2.67	2.44	2.49
	SD			1.44
22	$\bar{X}$	4.00	4.04	4.03
	SD			0.85
23	$\bar{X}$	3.67	4.41	4.27
	SD			1.01
24	$\bar{X}$	4.33	3.81	3.91
	SD			1.21
25	$\bar{X}$	3.33	3.67	3.61
	SD			1.30
26	$\bar{X}$	3.33	3.44	3.42
	SD			1.09
27	$\bar{X}$	4.33	4.59	4.55
	SD			0.87
28	$\bar{X}$	4.17	4.81	4.70
	SD			0.85
29	$\bar{X}$	4.33	4.70	4.64
	SD			0.70
30	$\bar{X}$	4.00	4.26	4.21
	SD			0.96

TABLE 8 (Continued)

Variable		Group I	Group II	Total
31	$\bar{X}$	3.67	4.15	4.06
	SD			1.03
32	$\bar{X}$	3.50	4.04	3.94
	SD			1.12
33	$\bar{X}$	3.17	3.96	3.82
	SD			1.10
34	$\bar{X}$	5.00	2.67	3.09
	SD			1.83
35	$\bar{X}$	1.33	1.26	1.27
	SD			1.04
36	$\bar{X}$	2.50	3.81	3.58
	SD			1.48
37	$\bar{X}$	3.83	2.44	2.70
	SD			1.76
38	$\bar{X}$	4.00	2.67	2.91
	SD			1.77
39	$\bar{X}$	3.17	4.70	3.03
	SD			0.88
40	$\bar{X}$	3.00	4.26	3.52
	SD			1.30
41	$\bar{X}$	3.00	3.04	3.03
	SD			1.05
42	$\bar{X}$	3.67	3.59	3.61
	SD			1.22
43	$\bar{X}$	3.17	3.04	3.06
	SD			1.37
44	$\bar{X}$	4.83	4.81	4.82
	SD			0.88
45	$\bar{X}$	4.83	4.63	4.67
	SD			0.54

TABLE 9

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO GROUPS
ON NINE SETS OF SELECTED PROVISIONS OF THE NEW STANDARDS

Set	Range		Group I	Group II	Total
I	6-30	$\bar{X}$	23.67	24.37	24.24
		SD			3.11
II	4-20	$\bar{X}$	12.50	11.22	11.45
		SD			3.80
III	6-30	$\bar{X}$	22.83	23.07	23.03
		SD			4.79
IV	7-35	$\bar{X}$	21.83	21.00	21.15
		SD			4.06
V	8-40	$\bar{X}$	28.00	24.74	25.33
		SD			5.13
VI	3-15	$\bar{X}$	11.83	12.85	12.67
		SD			1.71
VII	5-25	$\bar{X}$	18.67	21.11	20.67
		SD			3.90
VIII	3-15	$\bar{X}$	10.00	11.52	11.24
		SD			2.15
IX	3-15	$\bar{X}$	9.17	9.67	9.58
		SD			2.66

TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF UNIVARIATE
ANOVAs FOR FORTY-FIVE VARIABLES

Variable	F	Variable	F	Variable	F
1	5.871**	16	0.185	31	1.078
2	1.157	17	0.021	32	1.141
3	0.014	18	0.507	33	2.696
4	3.380*	19	0.505	34	10.357***
5	2.226	20	1.859	35	0.064
6	0.293	21	0.114	36	4.273**
7	1.943	22	0.009	37	2.944*
8	0.026	23	2.800*	38	2.941*
9	3.673*	24	0.901	39	0.170
10	0.363	25	0.317	40	1.154
11	0.308	26	0.049	41	0.006
12	1.123	27	0.429	42	0.018
13	1.504	28	3.058*	43	0.043
14	0.652	29	1.395	44	4.875**
15	0.217	30	0.351	45	0.692

*p $\angle$.10
**p $\angle$.05
***p $\angle$.01

TABLE 11

SUMMARY OF UNIVARIATE ANOVAs
FOR NINE SETS OF VARIABLES

Set	F	Set	F
I	0.245	V	2.048
II	0.547	VI	1.789
III	0.012	VII	1.985
IV	0.202	VIII	2.566
		IX	0.169

TABLE 12

DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS, STANDARDIZED WEIGHTS
AND STRUCTURE MATRIX AND MANOVA RESULTS FOR NINE
SETS OF SELECTED PROVISIONS OF THE NEW STANDARDS

Set	Discriminant Function	Standardized Weight	Structure Matrix
1	-0.037	-0.651	-0.133
2	-0.137	-2.925	0.198
3	0.196	5.305	-0.030
4	0.089	2.024	0.121
5	0.373	10.469	0.374
6	-0.800	-7.515	-0.351
7	-0.384	-8.213	-0.368
8	-0.080	-0.937	-0.415
9	-0.032	-0.473	-0.111

Wilks' Lambda= 0.5565

Rao's F(df = 9, 23) = 2.036, $p < .10$

Bartley's V(df = 9) = 15.5299, $p < .10$